

### REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 8-15 are pending in the application.

By this amendment, the Specification has been amended to substitute a single paragraph Abstract for the page marked, "Summary". Substitute drawings were submitted in order to indicate that Figs. 1 and 2 are "Prior Art" in response to the Examiner's objection under MPEP §608.02(g). In addition, Figs. 8-10 have replaced to insert "Yes" and "No" in place of the German designations.

Claims 1, 8, 9 and 11 have been amended. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 6 and 7. Claims 1, 8, 9 and 11 have been amended to clarify the text of the claims as required under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. New claims 14 and 15 recite the alternatives suggested by the language cancelled from claim 1. No new matter is believed to be added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action there was an objection to the drawings as consisting primarily of blocks and numbers. This objection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the drawings read clearly with the specification and unambiguously depict the elements called out by the specification. The indicia, "J" and "N" have been replaced with the corresponding English. Accordingly, the corrected drawings are in compliance with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.83(a), and removal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Figs. 1 and 2 were also objected to as not indicating "Prior Art". The substitute sheets rectify this matter, and removal of the objections is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Specifically the phrases, "such as", "and/or", and "the storage of data files with standard stools as layout (layout file)" were indicated to be unclear. The amended claims are believed to address those issues, and removal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-13 were objected based on the phrase, "to given operating condition". This language has been clarified by changing the language to recite,

"to actual operating conditions". Accordingly, the objection is believed to be overcome, and removal of the objections is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-3, 6 and 10-13 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lachhwani, et al, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0116418 A1. Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lachhwani, et al, taken in view of Nazem, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,983,227. Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lachhwani, et al, taken in view of Lim, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,370,582. Since claim 1 has been rewritten to include the features of allowed claim 7, and the remaining claims remain dependent from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections are moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **ALLOWED CLAIM**

In the outstanding Office Action, claim 7 was deemed allowable. Accordingly, independent claim 1 has been rewritten to include the limitations of claim 7 and interceding claim 6. Applicant appreciates the determination of allowability.

Appl. No. 10/076,959  
Art Unit: 2194  
Attorney Docket No. 24562  
Response to Office Action mailed  
April 7, 2005

### CONCLUSION


In light of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

**NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC**

Date: October 6, 2005

NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC  
1030 Fifteenth Street, N.W.  
Sixth Floor  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: (202) 775-8383  
Fax: (202) 775-8396

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary M. Nath  
Registration No. 26,965  
Gregory B. Kang  
Registration No. 45,273  
Stanley N. Protigal  
Registration No. 27,658  
Customer No. 20529

Appl. No. 10/076,959  
Art Unit: 2194  
Attorney Docket No. 24562  
Response to Office Action mailed  
April 7, 2005

### **SUBMISSION OF SUBSTITUTE DRAWINGS**

Substitute drawings are submitted herewith. The substitute drawings effect corrections to in order to indicate that Figs. 1 and 2 are "Prior Art" in response to the Examiner's objection under MPEP §608.02(g). In addition, Figs. 8-10 have replaced to insert "Yes" and "No" in place of the German designations. Please replace the drawing sheets labeled Fig 1, Fig. 2, Fig. 8, Fig. 9, and Fig. 10 pending in the application with the drawing sheet submitted herewith.